

REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Official Action dated September 8, 2006, wherein the Examiner rejected pending claims 1, 2, 4, 11-13, 26, 28 and 29. More specifically, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 13, 26, 28 and 29 as being anticipated by Greene, US Patent No. 6,185,410; rejected claims 4 and 12 as being unpatentable over Alpert, US Patent No. 5,742,666, in view of Tanaka, JP 08251313; and rejected claim 11 as being unpatentable over Alpert, US Patent No. 5,742,666, in view of Ebata et al., US Patent No. 6,487,542. However the references cited by the Examiner, either separately or in combination, fail to make known or obvious the claims of the present application. More specifically, the various references and/or combination of references fail to make known or obvious each and every feature of the claims. The specific reasoning supporting the applicants' conclusions are set forth below. As a result, reexamination and reconsideration of the above-identified application, in view of the present remarks, is hereby requested.

The applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 5-10, 14-24, 27 and 30 are allowed.

Relative to the Examiner's most recent rejection of claims, involving claims 1, 2, 13, 26, 28 and 29, the Examiner relies upon newly cited Greene, '410. However, in relying upon Greene, '410, the Examiner has parsed the claims and attempted to separately address the individual elements without regard to the contextual interaction of the elements. For example, in rejecting the claims, the Examiner acknowledges that a timer associated with multiple calls is relied upon in attempting to satisfy the various claimed interactions between elements, which in turn violates other expressly claimed relationships between some of the claimed features. The applicants have introduced additional language making the same even more clear. Specifically, the claim relates to a call and a timer that is initiated when the call is established, and sending the stored message ... when a predetermined time has elapsed on the timer. Any attempt to relate the sending of the stored message to a time elapsed on a timer other than the timer that is initiated when the call is established would violate the claimed relationship of the various elements. As a result, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Greene, '410, fails to make known or obvious each and every feature of the independent claims 1 and 26 and any of the claims, which depend therefrom.

With respect to claims 4 and 12, the claims have been amended to make even clearer the more permanent nature of the not sending (i.e. never sending) or terminating (i.e. terminating without resuming), as opposed to the temporary suspension associated with the Tanaka, '313, which has been previously noted.

With respect to claim 11, the claims have been amended to more clearly link the use of a digital signature with the use of the emergency information. As noted previously, in Ebata, '542, the digital signature was alternatively used in conjunction with financial information for purposes of establishing the security and ability to access the same. Further, the Examiner has not established the propriety of combining the teachings of the two references, where one reference involves financial information, and the other reference involves an emergency call. The applicants have suggested that one would generally not want to limit access to the emergency information associated with an emergency call, and therefore the specific teaching associated with the usage of a digital signature in association with financial information as taught or suggested in Ebata, '542, is generally not applicable to the use of a digital signature in association with emergency information of the type disclosed in Alpert, '666. Consequently, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, the Examiner has failed to articulate a suitable teaching which would make possible a combination that could be said to make known or obvious the teachings of claim 11.

As presently amended, the claims are allowable over the prior art of record for the reasons noted above. Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BY: /Lawrence Chapa/

Lawrence J. Chapa

Reg. No. 39,135

Phone (847) 523-0340

Fax. No. (847) 523-2350

Motorola, Inc.
Mobile Devices
Intellectual Property Department
600 North US Highway 45, W4 35Q
Libertyville, IL 60048